UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,558	06/08/2007	Irun R. Cohen	2488.041	3088
23405 7590 03/26/2008 HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI PC			EXAMINER	
5 COLUMBIA		NOBLE, MARCIA STEPHENS		
ALBANY, NY	12203		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1632	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/591,558	COHEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	MARCIA S. NOBLE	1632				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	<del>'=</del>					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)☑ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> are subject to restriction and/or e  Application Papers	lection requirement.					
<u> </u>						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o		• •	ED 1 121(d)			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			0 .02.			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori  application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	nte				

Application/Control Number: 10/591,558 Page 2

Art Unit: 1632

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-48 are pending.

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-9, drawn to a DNA vaccine composition comprising an isolated nucleic acid encoding an antigen selected from CD25, homologs, and fragments thereof operably linked to a transcription control sequence, and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, adjuvant, excipient, or diluent.

Group II, claim(s) 10-48, drawn a method of preventing or inhibiting the development of a T-cell mediated pathology comprising administering a CD25 DNA vaccine.

The inventions listed as Groups I-II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

- A) The invention has no special technical feature that defined the contribution over the prior art, or
- B) Unity of invention between different categories of inventions will only be found to exist if specific combinations of inventions are present. Those combinations include:
  - 1) A product and a special process of manufacture of said product.
  - 2) A product and a process of use of said product.
- 3) A product, a special process of manufacture of said product, and a process of use of said product.
  - 4) A process and an apparatus specially designed to carry out said process.
- 5) A product, a special process of manufacture of said product, and an apparatus specially designed to carry out said process.

The allowed combinations do not include multiple products, multiple methods of using said products, and methods of making multiple products as claimed in the instant application, see MPEP § 1850.

Applicant's claims encompass multiple inventions and do not have a special technical feature which link the inventions one to the other, and lack unity of invention.

Art Unit: 1632

A) The invention had no special technical feature that defined the contribution over the prior art because Kokuho et al (J Vet Med Sci 62(8):841-847, 2000) discloses the invention of claim 1.

Claim 1 is drawn to a DNA vaccine composition comprising an isolated nucleic acid sequence encoding an antigen selected from CD25, homolog, or fragment thereof; the nucleic acid sequence being operably linked to one or more transcription control sequences and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, adjuvant, excipient or diluent.

The breadth of the claimed product encompasses a nucleic acid encoding CD25 or a fragment thereof and a transcription control element. Kokuho et al discloses Lamda FIX II phage clones encoding a porcine IL-1R $\alpha$  gene (p. 841, col 2, par 2) and pBluescript II SK expression vectors comprising exon 1 of porcine IL-1R $\alpha$  gene and the minimal TATA box transcription control sequence (p. 842, col 2, last par).

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- a) SEQ ID NOS:2-4;
- b) multiple sclerosis, rheumatoid arthritis, autoimmune neuritis; system lupus erythematosus, psoriasis, Type I diabetes mellitus, Sjogren's disease, thyroid disease, and myasthenia gravis

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

The claims encompass the genuses of a) CD25 polypeptides and b) T-cell mediated autoimmune diseases

The following claim(s) are generic: 4, 13, 15, 25, 27, 36, and 44.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: a) each of the sequences of SEQ ID NOS 2-4 have a different primary structure; b) each of the species of T-cell mediated autoimmune disease affect different tissues and affect different pathologies and symptoms.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 5

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result

Application/Control Number: 10/591,558 Page 6

Art Unit: 1632

in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCIA S. NOBLE whose telephone number is (571)272-5545. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Paras can be reached on (571) 272-4517. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marcia S. Noble

/Peter Paras, Jr./
Peter Paras, Jr.
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1632